DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 621 FL 022 452

AUTHOR Underwood, Karen; Brunner, Anita
TITLE Evaluation of Programs for Limited English Proficient Students, Fiscal Year 1993 (School Year 1992-1993).
INSTITUTION Idaho State Dept. of Education, Boise.
PUB DATE [93]
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; Data Collection; Elementary Education; Elementary Schools; Enrollment Rate; High Schools; Identification; *Inservice Teacher Education; Junior High Schools; *Limited English Speaking; Mathematics Instruction; Middle Schools; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; School Districts; Science Instruction; Second Language Programs; Staff Utilization; State Surveys; *Student Characteristics; *Student Placement; Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS *Idaho

ABSTRACT

Data on limited-English-proficient (LEP) students in Idaho's public schools and programs that serve this population are presented. Information was drawn from program applications and reports submitted to the state, site visits, and written LEP program assessments. The first part of the report summarizes data of LEP students and programs, including their levels of achievement (above or below district averages, for elementary, middle/junior, and high schools), instructional services provided through both private and public programs, and LEP students' access to district core curricula. Staffing patterns are also reported in this section. The report's second part describes state technical assistance activities, principally through inservice teacher education programs and monitoring of program compliance with regulations. Sheltered science and math workshops and other presentations are listed. Part 3 reports survey conclusions. Findings include continuing intensive efforts statewide to identify and provide services for LEP students. LEP students continue to perform below grade expectations, and use of other standards of success is recommended. Identification methods are not consistent across of within districts. Most LEP students are identified in the lower grades, and an effort is made to provide instruction in the mainstream classroom. Data summaries are appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FL

ED 375 621

IDAHO STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS FOR LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS

Fiscal Year 1993
(School Year 1992 - 1993)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Karen Underwood
Supervisor
Compensatory Education

Anita Brunner
Consultant
ESL/Bilingual Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. L. Evans
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The observations included in this report are those of a private external evaluator with a professional background in evaluation and bilingual education.

FL022452

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Part One: Summary of Data on LEP Students and Programs 4

Part Two: State Technical Assistance Activities 9

Part Three: Conclusions 12

Appendix A: LEA Program Plan Data 14

Appendix B: Program Assessment Data 19

INTRODUCTION

This report is submitted by the Idaho State Department of Education in compliance with Part 548 of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations governing grants to State Educational Agency Programs under the Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Paragraph 548.10 of the regulations requires that the state "collect, aggregate, analyze, and publish data and information on the limited English proficient persons in the State and the educational services provided or available to those persons."

The Department has collected, aggregated, analyzed and published data on the State's limited English proficient (LEP) students since 1983. Part One of this report is a summary of the highlights of the information gained from the data collection.

Paragraph 548.11 of the Bilingual Education Act allows the state educational agency to use Title VII funds to engage in additional activities, such as planning, developing, reviewing and evaluating educational programs for limited English proficient students, providing or coordinating technical assistance, and providing training to carry out programs such as those assisted by the Act. The other activities conducted by the department under its Title VII grant include:

1) Reviewing and evaluating limited English proficient programs.

2) Providing, coordinating, or supervising technical and other forms of non-financial assistance to school districts (LEAs), community organizations, and private elementary and secondary schools that serve LEP students.

3) Developing and administering procedures for the identification of LEP students and the assessment of their educational needs and competencies.

4) Providing staff development activities designed to improve services to LEP students.

5) Designing activities and services to build the capacity of the LEAs to meet the educational needs of LEP students.

Part Two of this report is a summary of the state's efforts toward accomplishing these activities.

The State sets the following requirements for all school districts:

1) Conduct a home language survey to determine if a language other than English is spoken at home.

2) Assess children from homes where a language other than English is spoken for English language proficiency.

3) Design and structure a program of instruction to meet the educational needs of identified LEP students.

4) Submit a formal project application for SDE approval which outlines a program to meet the educational needs of LEP students.

5) Measure and report the progress of LEP students.

6) Report to the State Department of Education the results of an LEA program evaluation.

7) Submit LEP data to the SDE as required by Public Law 100-297 and a U.S. District Court Consent Decree of 1983, Civil No. 79-1068.

Requirements 4, 5 and 6 provide the basis for gathering the information contained in the present report. The state of Idaho collects that information in three ways. First is through a document called an Education Plan for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. The document is in the form of a questionnaire and is sent to all school districts in the state in the fall. Districts that have any limited English proficient students enrolled complete the form and return it to the State Department of Education. Other districts submit a written statement to the effect that no LEP students are enrolled. In fall 1992, 64 districts completed and returned the questionnaire, as compared to 71 districts in 1991, 70 districts in 1990 and 44 districts in 1989. This trend may be attributable to a greater enrollment of LEP students in more districts or greater awareness of districts toward LEP students.

The second method of collecting information is a site visit by the Title VII Bilingual/ESL Consultant and the other staff of the Compensatory Education Bureau to verify first-hand the LEP enrollment data and obtain detailed information on the kinds of services provided by the district in terms of personnel, materials, and instructional strategies. In 1992-93, SEA staff visited 69 districts for program or compliance reviews. All but five districts visited were found to be in compliance with state and federal guidelines and provisions of the Consent Decree. Non-compliance issues in the other five districts are described below.

State policy requires annual review of all districts with an LEP population, in accordance with the 1983 consent decree. The above-mentioned on-site reviews are one approach to meeting this requirement. Another approach is through the third method of data collection, which is a written Assessment of the Limited English Proficient Program, completed by districts that submitted a Plan in the fall. This assessment also reports data on enrollment figures, assessment, parent involvement, and staff development.

Previously, only districts that had submitted a fall application and were not visited by a State Department representative submitted this spring assessment.

The Assessment is an efficient way to meet the annual review requirement, given that time, budgetary and personnel constraints make it prohibitive to visit all districts that report LEP enrollment. Demographics have changed in Idaho since the time of the consent decree, when LEP students were concentrated in fewer districts. It is now common for even smaller, more remote districts to enroll at least a few LEP students. Fifty-six districts submitted the assessment by June, 1993, down by 14 from the year before.

The information contained in this report is derived from the three sources described above. Part One represents the statewide totals of data provided by individual districts, with comments and interpretation. Detailed summaries of the data from data collection instruments are provided in the appendices, along with some additional commentary. Part Two describes the state's technical assistance and training activities. Part Three consists of conclusions drawn from Parts One and Two.

Invitation to comment: This report is intended to provide useful information to interested persons in the State Department of Education, local school districts, and the general public. Comments and questions about the information contained in this report may be directed to:

Anita Brunner, Consultant
Idaho Department of Education
Len B. Jordan Office Building
650 W. State St.
Boise ID 83720-3650
(208) 334-2195

or to the author of this report:

Dr. Gary Hargett
9795 SW Taylor St.
Portland OR 97225

PART ONE: SUMMARY OF DATA ON LEP STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS

STUDENT IDENTIFICATION

The September 25, 1992 school census showed a statewide student population of 231,668 in the public schools in grades K-12. The 64 districts that identified LEP students in 1992 reported a total school population of 195,857. Thus some 84.5% of Idaho public school students are enrolled in districts that are impacted to a greater or lesser degree by language minority students. Among these students, the initial home language survey identified students from nearly 40 non-English language groups. The number of students identified by non-English home language was 11,986, an increase of 2,271 (23.3%) over the 8,199 identified the previous year. The figure of 11,986 means that 5.2% of the state's students are not from English-speaking backgrounds or are from backgrounds with a significant impact of a non-English language.

The largest home language group was Spanish, with 9,587, which is 80.7% of the total number of students from non-English backgrounds. The number of reported Spanish-background students increased by 1,301 over the previous year. The percentage of students with Spanish backgrounds decreased by about 5% as a proportion of the entire non-English background population. The second largest group continued to be Native American languages, with 1,275, which is 757 more than the previous year. This probably reflected a greater awareness of the language and cultural backgrounds of Native Americans and their special needs in school. The third largest group was Vietnamese, with 123; in previous years Laotians had been the third largest group. Their numbers remained comparable to the past, suggesting that Idaho may have experienced a recent influx of Vietnamese.

Further details of the numbers of students from different language groups are provided in Appendix A.

Home languages other than English are identified through a variety of methods. Sixty-one districts reported using observation and referral by school personnel; forty-eight reported that a question on home language background is routinely asked during enrollment; fifty-seven utilized a home visit or parent conference; and twenty-eight utilized a written home survey. Clearly, most districts took advantage of more than one method of identification.

Public school districts are required to assess the English proficiency of students with a home language other than English. The districts reported assessing 5,647 students; this figure is lower by about 2,000 than the previous year's but undoubtedly more accurate and appropriate. The revised version of the spring survey used in 1993 explicitly differentiated home language and assessment, which probably clarified the distinction for many respondents.

A total of 4,596 were identified as limited in English proficiency, an increase of 779 over the 1991-92 school year. Thus 47.5% of the students with non-English backgrounds were determined to be LEP.

Means of assessing English language proficiency were reported in the fall Education Plans, whether by an explicit English proficiency test or standardized achievement tests. Forty-three reporting using an English proficiency test, and 38 reported using a standardized achievement test. The most frequently named language proficiency test continued to be the Language Assessment Scales (LAS), and the most frequently named standardized achievement test was the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). Most districts reported using an English proficiency instrument in addition to the standardized measure. The LAS, which is published by CTB McGraw-Hill, is designed to be a measure of oral English proficiency, testing subskills of sound discrimination and production, vocabulary, aural comprehension and oral production. Some districts are now also using the LAS R/W, which tests reading and writing skills among LEP students at the elementary grade levels. The detailed information in Appendix A shows that 52 districts specified the ITBS, but only 38 checked the option indicating that a standardized achievement test was used. This anomaly suggests confusion among the respondents as to the question's meaning. Many who checked the ITBS may have done so because it is their districts' chosen standardized test, not realizing that the intent of the question was whether the test was used to assess limited English proficiency. Some may have confused "standardized achievement test" with "Stanford Achievement Test" because of the acronym.

EDUCATIONAL CONDITION OF LEP STUDENTS

More detailed information on LEP students' educational condition came from the respondents to the program assessment, as follows. (This information is also found in Appendix B.)

The program assessment asked respondents to report the number of LEP students in the three grade ranges listed below who scored the district average or at or above the district average in reading, mathematics, and language arts as measured by the district's standardized test. The following table shows the totals of the responses.

	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE/JR HIGH		HIGH SCHOOL	
	Below	At or Above	Below	At or Above	Below	At or Above
Reading	1074	150	251	54	139	64
Math	862	329	224	76	104	93
Language Arts	962	144	246	47	121	46

This question is asked because it is contained on the form the State is required to fill out for the federal government as part of its Title VII grant. LEP students would be presumed by definition to be performing below average due in part to language differences.

The smaller numbers at the higher grade levels are consistent with the fact that fewer LEP students tend to be identified and served at those levels, in part because those who are not recent immigrants have acquired sufficient proficiency to at least appear fluent, even if they lack academic language skills.

INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES FOR LEP STUDENTS

The spring program assessment survey showed a statewide total of 4,559 LEP students being served in special LEP programs. That figure falls only 37 students short of the total identified as LEP. Following are the numbers reported to be served in special programs:

Grade	Public	Private
K	609	
1	606	4
2	473	1
3	478	4
4	404	5
5	348	4
6	318	
7	259	
8	266	
9	253	
10	272	
11	162	
12	111	
TOTAL	4559	20

When asked what sources of funds supported the special programs, 53 reported regular district funds, and 50 reported Chapter One, often including Migrant. Three districts received grants under Title VII, the Bilingual Education Act.

Different methods are used by the districts to serve LEP children in order to develop their English language skills and academic and cognitive knowledge. These methods include different approaches to teaching English as a second language (ESL), delivery of content instruction, the role of the native language in instruction, the roles of teachers and aides, in-class and out-of-class settings, kinds of materials used, and utilization of peer interaction. Respondents to the fall Education Plan were asked to select the descriptions of approaches which matched their local practices.

Fifty-four districts reported that the regular teacher provides English language development; 53 reported that it was provided by an instructional aide, 28 by an ESL teacher, and 14 reported "other". The "others" were variously described as tutors, Chapter 1 teachers, migrant aides, etc. These figures are very comparable to the previous year's.

Districts were asked in what setting English language development was provided. Sixty-one responded that it occurred in the regular classroom and 56 in individual or small group pullout settings. Twenty-eight answered that it occurred in ESL classrooms, and four "other".

Access to District Core Curriculum

The State Department of Education recognizes that educational services to LEP students must encompass more than English language development, although that is a critical and basic aspect of services. However, it is not reasonable to expect LEP students to first become fully proficient in English and then "catch up" with other students in academic knowledge and cognitive skills. Therefore, the Education Plan asks the districts to indicate what methods they are using to provide LEP students access to the core curriculum. They were asked to select among various options to describe how the access was provided. Following are the numbers of districts that reported using each method.

Only two reported that no special provisions were made, as compared to three in 1991. Of the rest, 60 reported "modified mainstream", through a variety of means, most commonly through peer tutoring or cooperative learning or adaptation of regular materials. Twenty-nine reported content instruction in students' first language, most commonly with an instructional assistant in a pull-out situation. Details of responses are presented in Appendix A.

Staffing

The Education Plan also indicated how many district staff members in various categories were specifically assigned per job description to serve LEP children.

Positions	Number
Teachers:	
Elementary	102
Middle School	34
Junior High School	35
High School	24
ESL/Bilingual Resource Teacher	26

Aides:	
Elementary	112
Middle/Junior High	48
High School	32
Counselors:	
Elementary	15
Middle/Junior High	17
High School	16
Psychologists:	10
Other:	42
TOTAL	513

The figures on staff specifically assigned to serve LEP students cannot be taken at face value. Some districts essentially claim that all their teachers are so assigned because they expect their teachers to teach everyone effectively. This is philosophically appealing but does not answer the intent of the survey. Some respondents misunderstood the instructions and merely put check marks instead of numbers.

PART TWO: STATE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES

The State Department of Education employs an ESL/Bilingual Education consultant funded under the Title VII grant, who is responsible for monitoring the districts' programs for LEP students and for providing technical assistance to them. The purpose of this technical assistance is to build the capacity of the state and the districts to meet the educational needs of limited English proficient persons.

The technical assistance efforts in 1992-93, as in previous years, were in two categories:

1) Sponsoring a series of workshops and classes for college credit throughout the state on topics concerned with the identification and instruction of LEP students.

2) Conducting site reviews of districts to monitor compliance with state requirement for the education of LEP students.

Sheltered Science and Math Workshops

The most significant training effort was a series of three-day workshops for credit through Boise State University on "Sheltered Science and Math: Strategies for Meeting the Needs of Language Minority Students in Mainstream Science and Math Classrooms". The class was conducted by Ron Rohac, a consultant from San Bernardino, California who had taught high school chemistry. The Bilingual Consultant, Anita Brunner, conceived the project and took responsibility for all arrangements, coordination, and scheduling. She obtained financial support from Eisenhower reallocation funds, which were supplemented by Title VII and Migrant Education funds to support the direct costs of the trainings. The Title VII grant supported Ms. Brunner's time and mileage.

The workshops were primarily directed toward math and science teachers in upper elementary through secondary levels, Chapter 1, and ESL teachers. However, they were open to any and all who were interested. The training was originially planned for a total of 12 days at four sites. However, response was so great that three sites were added for a total of 21 training days. Approxiately 400 teachers participated; 350 elected to enroll for college credit.

Following are the sites and dates of the Sheltered Science and Math workshops.

Site	Dates
Idaho Falls	October 19
	October 20
	December 16
	December 17
	February 10
	February 11

Burley	October 21 December 15 February 9
Boise	October 27 October 28 December 8 December 9 February 2 February 3
Twin Falls	October 22 December 14 February 8
Coeur d'Alene	October 26 December 7 February 1

Whole Language Spanish Class

The Bilingual Consultant arranged for Roberto Bahruth to present a Whole Language Spanish class to several districts. The class served a double purpose, to teach basic Spanish to school personnel and to model the whole language teaching approach. Participants were eligible for college credit granted through Boise State University's Continuing Education. The class was presented at: Jefferson School District, Minidoka School District, and Boise State University.

Other Presentations Sponsored

The office supported a presentation by Heide Spruck Wrigley, of Aguirre International, on "Promising Practices in Adult ESL Literacy"at the state Adult Basic Education-ESL Conference on August 5, 1992.

The grant supported a workshop on "Literature-Based Language Acquisition Pedagogy" at Boise State University June 21-25, 1993.

The Title VII grant was used to pay Linda Davenport, from Portland, Oregon, to present "LEP Strategies for the Classroom Teacher" at Idaho Falls District, October 19 and 20.

The Consultant arranged for Janet Freeman, a consultant from Portland, Oregon to present on "Teaching the Limited English Proficient Student in the Mainstream Science Classroom" at the fall conference of the Idaho Science Teachers Association, held October 1-3, 1992 in Post Falls.

In collaboration with the regional Title IV Desegregation Assistance Center and the State's Sex Equity Consultant, the Bilingual Consultant helped organize and promote a two-part Equity Team Building Institute which was held November 4-5, 1992 and April 6-7, 1993.

The Consultant presented a session called "Shaping Board Policies to Meet the Needs of Bilingual Students" at the 1992 Annual Convention of the Idaho School Boards Association, held November 11-14 in Boise. The session addressed the legal requirements of school districts to provide equitable education for bilingual, limited English proficient students and acquainted participants with research on second language acquisition, bilingual education, and teaching English to speakers of other languages.

Site Reviews

The Consent Decree requires the state to monitor all districts for compliance with the provisions of the decree and to offer recommendations and observations regarding the kinds and quality of services offered to LEP students. The State Bilingual/ESL Consultant receives support from other personnel within the Compensatory Education Bureau to conduct these reviews. (As stated in the introduction to this report, State policy requires annual review of all districts with an LEP population. The questionnaires submitted in the fall and spring substitute to a degree for on-site reviews, given the staff, time and budgetary constraints that make visits to all districts impossible. These documents provide most of the essential information and form a basis for deciding which districts need to be visited in person.)

In 1992-93, State Department of Education staff conducted 69 on-site compliance and program reviews, 28 more than the previous year and 31 more than in 1990-91. Thirteen were conducted by the Bilingual/ESL Consultant, 15 by the migrant coordinator, and 41 by Chapter One staff. The reviewers commended districts for efforts at staff development, content area support, providing English language development classes for high school credit, and parent outreach. Five districts were found to be out of compliance. The most common reason, shared by all five, was reliance on supplementary programs such as Chapter 1-Migrant to support special services for LEP students without allocating district funds to regularize such services as a district responsibility. Four of the districts were criticized for inadequate provision of English language development and/or comprehensible access to the curriculum. One district was cited for referring LEP students to special education teachers solely for English language development and not on the basis of qualifying handicapping conditions.

PART THREE: CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this report show a continuing intensive effort statewide, under leadership of the State Department of Education, to identify and provide educational services to students whose home or native language is other than English. This was particularly evident in the major training efforts, such as the series of sheltered math and science workshops, and the larger number of on-site compliance reviews that were completed.

The number of districts responding to the surveys declined from the previous year, after showing great advances. It is important to ascertain whether the non-responding districts actually did not enroll LEP students.

LEP students continue to perform below grade expectations, according to the perceptions of the school personnel who submitted the annual program assessment. However, by definition, a student limited in English proficiency could not perform at grade level, particularly when standardized tests are used as a criterion. It would be desirable to look for additional indicators of educational success for LEP students, including less retention in grade, lower drop-out rates, and evidence of achievement in the core curriculum by non-traditional measures. (These standards would also be measures of the success of the schools, not just the LEP students, particularly regarding changes in practices in grade retention.)

There is little uniformity among the districts in their approaches to identifying LEP students; methods include language proficiency testing, interpretation of standardized test scores, informal testing, and observation and referral. Even within districts, there is evidence that identification and assessment of limited English proficiency are not necessarily guided by consistently applied criteria. This is particularly evident when observation and judgment are the cited bases of identification and assessment.

The trend in 1992-93 continued for most LEP students to be identified in the lower grades, concentrated in kindergarten and first and second grade. The fact that identified LEP children are concentrated in the lower grades suggests that determination of English proficiency is based on interpersonal communicative language skills, which do develop rapidly, especially among young children. However, the data on the educational condition of LEP students offer evidence that more districts are aware that lack of such academic skills as reading and school-learned vocabulary also are part of English proficiency.

The State Department of Education, especially in the person of the Bilingual/ESL Consultant, has continued to promote the principle that responsibility for the education of LEP children lies within the classroom, not in pull-out or categorical programs, although these may have a legitimate supplemental role to play. The Consultant continued to make available trainings in approaches to mainstreaming in support of this principle. This principle was seen in the fact that five districts found to be out of compliance with legal responsibilities were relying on supplemental and categorical funds rather than district funds to ensure access to services.

The State Superintendent of Schools supported an effort for the Legislature to "provide definitions for and computation of support units and to provide an allowance for limited English proficiency." That provision was not enacted, but it is to the Superintendent's credit that he recognizes the needs of schools for extra support in meeting the LEP students' challenge. The data contained in this report show that the schools are attempting to meet this challenge and that they need resources to do so.

Recommendations

Several of the surveys that were returned showed confusion on the part of the respondent. In some cases, check-marks were made where specific numbers were called for, thus compromising the accuracy of the statewide totals. Many respondents still answer the personnel question on the Education Plan with FTE levels rather than numbers of staff, and some do not take into account that the questions specifies persons designated by job description to serve LEP students, as opposed to those who happen to serve them in the course of regular responsibilities. Surveys should be reviewed for such confusion and technical assistance given in understanding the correct way to complete the forms.

The State should continue its intensive efforts in technical assistance, both through on-site monitoring and sponsorship of trainings and workshops.

Given the increasing number of LEP students, other program models besides sheltered mainstream will become feasible. The State could help initiate planning for true bilingual education and promoting career ladders for bilingual paraprofessionals to become certified teachers.

Appendix A

LEA DATA FROM EDUCATION PLAN

FOR LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP) STUDENTS

Summary of LEA Responses

LEA DATA FROM EDUCATION PLAN
FOR LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP) STUDENTS

The data in this section are compiled from the responses of 64 districts that completed and returned the Education Plan for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students in the fall of 1992.

Total public school enrollment in responding districts: 195,857

Total private school enrollment within responding districts: 5,008

Total public and private enrollment in responding districts: 200,865

Total numbers of districts that reported having a written policy regarding the education of students with limited English proficiency. Yes 36 No 27

In 1991, 46 districts had reported a written policy. The smaller number reported here is due in part to the fact that some of the districts that had written policies did not respond to the survey.

Methods reported to be used by districts to identify students with a home language other than English.

Routinely asked as part of enrollment	48
Observation and referral by school personnel	61
Written home survey	28
Home visit or parent conference	51
Other	7

Districts are required to assess the English proficiency of students who may be LEP. Respondents asked whether they met the requirement with an English proficiency test or a standardized achievement tests and with which specific instrument.

English Proficiency Test	43
Pre-LAS (Language Assessment Scales)	24
Language Assessment Scales	43
IDEA Proficiency Test	8
Other	29
Standardized Achievement Test	38
Iowa Test of Basic Skills	52
Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills	2
California Achievement Test	2
Other	15

These figures suggest that some respondents might have confused Standardized Achievement Test with the Stanford Achievement Test, which shares the same acronym and is a distinct published test.

Fifty-seven respondents also reported using classroom performance as a basis of assessing English proficiency.

Number of students currently classified as LEP per the fall plan: 4,126

Districts were asked whether there were specified criteria for identifying students who no longer need special attention in the areas of ESL or bilingual education.
Yes 55 No 7

The districts that responded yes were asked to indicate on which of the following the criteria were based.

Standardized test scores	44
Grades	47
Teacher judgment	55
Other	21

Clearly, most districts use a combination of indicators in deciding whether a student no longer requires special attention.

The districts indicated who provides English language development for LEP students.

Regular teacher	54
ESL teacher	28
Instructional aide	53
Other	14

They indicated in what setting English language development is provided.

Regular classroom	61
ESL classroom	28
Individual/small group pull-out	56
Other	4

The districts indicated what methods are used in the district to provide LEP students access to the district core curriculum.

Methods of Addressing Core Curriculum	Number
No special provisions	2
Modified mainstream classroom	60
Assistance by ESL resource teacher	34
ESL in content area	34
Adaptation of regular materials	52
Supplemental native language materials	30
In-class native language support	25
Peer tutoring/cooperative learning	55
Content instruction in students' language	29
Provided by:	
Bilingual certified teacher	14
Instructional assistant	34
Other	7
In the setting of:	
Regular classroom	33
Resource room	17
Pull-out	30
Pull-out content tutoring	47
After-hours content tutoring	28

Number of persons who are specifically assigned per job description to serve LEP students:

Positions	Number
Teachers	
Elementary	102
Middle School	34
Junior High School	35
High School	24
ESL/Bilingual Resource Teacher	26
Aides	
Elementary	112
Middle/Junior High	48
High School	32
Counselors	
Elementary	15
Middle/Junior High	17
High School	16
Psychologists	10
Other	42
TOTAL	513

The respondents reported the sources of funds which supported special services for LEP students.

Source	No. of Districts Utilizing
Regular district funds	53
Title VII	3
Transitional	3
Special Alternative	
Special Populations	
Developmental	
Head Start	7
Even Start	2
Chapter 1	50
Chapter 2	11
Emergency Immigrant Education Assistance Act	8
Other	13

Who is responsible for monitoring the progress of LEP students in language development and content instruction?

Director of Educational Program for LEP Students	34
Teacher	50
Counselor	13
Other	31

Is native language translation for parents provided for each of the following?

	Yes	No
Parent-teacher conferences	59	4
Written notes	55	7
Flyers, newsletters	41	14
Parent meetings	49	10

Districts were asked about their practices in staff development regarding the education of LEP students.

	Yes	No
Does the district pre-service and/or issues in the education of limited English proficient children?	46	17
Does the district provide workshops, in-services or course work for staff who are designated to serve LEP children?	52	12
Does the district conduct needs assessments for the staff development of persons assigned to serve LEP children?	42	21
Does the district as a matter of policy hire staff to work with LEP children based on relevant credentials or training?	44	17

Appendix B

LEP PROGRAM ASSESSMENT DATA

Summary of LEA Responses

ASSESSMENT OF THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT PROGRAM

(Responding districts only) Public School Enrollment: 182,792 Private Schools: 4,693

Language Group	Number in Group	Number Assessed	Number Identified LEP
Basque	72	19	0
Cambodian	16	12	2
Chinese	48	35	18
Czechoslovakian	1	1	1
Farsi (Persian)	2	2	1
Filipino	14	12	8
German	18	11	3
Japanese	60	30	15
Korean	15	11	10
Laotian	112	106	50
Native American	1275	119	59
Polish	10	10	3
Portuguese	67	27	16
Rumanian	89	84	73
Spanish	9587	4905	4129
Thai	12	12	10
Vietnamese	123	85	53
Other	355	166	145
TOTAL	11876	5647	4596

How many students were limited in their English proficiency? 4596

How were these numbers determined? Formal Language Assessment: 38 Informal Language Assessment: 46 Teacher Observation: 49

Number per grade level served in Limited English Proficiency programs:

Grade	Public	Private
K	609	
1	606	4
2	473	1
3	478	4
4	404	5
5	348	4
6	318	
7	259	
8	266	
9	253	
10	272	
11	162	
12	111	
TOTAL	4559	20

Does the district have a policy exempting some LEP students from standardized testing?
Yes: 30 No: 30

Number of LEP students exempted from standardized achievement testing this year: 1117

How many scored below the district average on the standardized test, and how many scored at or above the average on the subject matter listed below?

	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE/JR HIGH		HIGH SCHOOL	
	Below	At or Above	Below	At or Above	Below	At or Above
Reading	1074	150	251	54	139	64
Math	862	329	224	76	104	93
Language Arts	962	144	246	47	121	46

Number of LEP students referred to or placed in special education: 275

Number of LEP students retained in grade: 57

Number of LEP students who dropped out of school: 107

How are parents kept informed of LEP activities?

Method	Number	Documentation Kept?	
		Yes	No
Parent Meetings	43	41	3
Parent/Teacher Conferences	54	52	3
Written Notices	49	39	9
Other	26	11	3

Number of meetings specifically held for parents of LEP students: 177

Indicate how many LEP students were served in programs specifically designed for their needs, funded by each of the following sources:

Source	Number
Regular district funds	1896
Title VII	254
Transitional	208
Special Alternative	
Special Populations	
Developmental	
Head Start	8
Even Start	21
Chapter 1	1049
Chapter 1-Migrant	2669
Chapter 2	385
Emergency Immigrant Education Assistance Act	754
Other	17

To what degree are persons involved in the LEP program adequately trained to meet LEP students' needs? (This was rated on a five-point scale where 1 = "inadequate" and 5 = "adequate".)

	1	2	3	4	5
Aides/Tutors	1	8	15	19	11
Teachers	1	14	14	11	15
Administrators	2	14	13	15	7
Counselors	4	17	18	10	3
Parents	6	13	22	8	1

For what topics is there a need for training in your program?

Topic	Number
Language Acquisition Theories	32
Multicultural Awareness	35
Language Assessment	31
ESL Materials	43
Methods of Teaching ESL	51
Cooperative Learning	21
Sheltered Mainstream Classrooms	29
Peer Coaching	21
Other	5

How many trainings were held for each group?

Aides/Tutors	159
Teachers	129
Administrators	69
Counselors	32
Parents	44
TOTAL	433

The following districts submitted plans in 1991 but in 1992 reported that they enrolled no LEP children and therefore did not submit a plan:

Clark County	Ririe
Challis	Nez Perce
McKay	Dietrich
Cottonwood	Rockland

The following districts submitted plans in 1991 but did not submit either a plan or certification of no LEP enrollment in 1992:

Butte County	Grace
Notus	Homedale
Parma	Murtaugh
Canyon	

Federal law prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability in any educational programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance. (Title VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.)

It is the policy of the Idaho State Department of Education not to discriminate in any educational programs or activities or in employment practices.

Inquiries regarding compliance with this nondiscriminatory policy may be directed to Jerry L. Evans, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 650 West State Street, Boise, Idaho 83720-3650, (208) 334-3300, or to the Director, Office of Civil Rights, Department of Education, Washington, D.C.